

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and the rejections of claims 1-5, 7 and 9-28 are respectfully requested. Applicant has attempted to address every ground for rejection in the Office Action dated June 23, 2010 (Paper No. 20100617) and believes the application is now in condition for allowance. The specification and the claims have been amended to better describe the invention.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant has amended the specification to include the appropriate section headings. Note that section headings were also added in the preliminary amendment filed on September 12, 2006.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR §1.83(a) because the Examiner states that the embodiment showing more than one inner cap and more than one outer cap of claim 1 must be shown in the drawings or cancelled from the claims. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the locking device includes “at least one first segment being realized as an inner cap” and “at least one second segment being realized as an outer cap.” The drawings support the subject matter of “an inner cap” and “an outer cap.” Accordingly, Applicant requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that the subject matter of “at least one first segment being realized as at least one inner cap” and “at least one second segment being realized as at least one outer cap” is not

U.S. Serial No. 10/568,828
Amendment Dated: September 23, 2010
Response to Office Action Dated: June 23, 2010

supported by the specification. Applicant has amended the claims as shown above to recite “an inner cap” and “an outer cap,” which is supported by the specification and the drawings.

Additionally, the Examiner states that many of the remaining claims include the phrase “at least one.” The Examiner requires that Applicant show support for this subject matter in the specification or cancel the subject matter from the claims. The subject matter of claim 10 (at least one guide device) is supported in the specification on page 8, lines 12-16 and page 11, lines 7-12. Furthermore, the subject matter of claim 11 (at least one snap device) is supported in the specification on page 12, lines 6-12 and page 15, lines 10-14. The subject matter of claim 13 (at least one shaving device) is supported in the specification on page 10, lines 6-23 and on page 13, lines 4-9 and 14-25. Also, the subject matter of claim 17 (at least one turnable device) is supported in the specification on page 14, lines 1-12. Applicant has amended the remaining claims to remove the “at least one” phrase where applicable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of the claims under §112 be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the above-identified remarks, the claims in their present form are patentably distinct over the art of record. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner

U.S. Serial No. 10/568,828
Amendment Dated: September 23, 2010
Response to Office Action Dated: June 23, 2010

discover there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By /Christopher S. Hermanson/
Christopher S. Hermanson
Reg. No. 48,244
Attorney for Applicant

September 23, 2010
300 S. Wacker Drive - Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel.: (312) 360-0080
Fax: (312) 360-9315
Customer No.: 24978